<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Introduction</strong> of problem, question or issue</th>
<th><strong>Advanced (4)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Proficient (3)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Developing (2)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Beginning (1)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Clearly identifies the challenge and subsidiary, embedded, or implicit aspects of the problem, question or issue.</td>
<td>- Clearly identifies the challenge and subsidiary, embedded, or implicit aspects of the problem, question or issue.</td>
<td>- Summarizes the problem, question or issue but some nuances and details are missing or glossed over.</td>
<td>- Summarizes problem, question or issue, though some aspects are incorrect or confused.</td>
<td>- Fails to accurately identify and summarize problem, question or issue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentation, interpretation and analysis of information, data, or <strong>evidence</strong></th>
<th><strong>Advanced (4)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Proficient (3)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Developing (2)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Beginning (1)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Examines and addresses evidence and its source.</td>
<td>- Provides evidence of search, selection, and source evaluation skills.</td>
<td>- Demonstrates adequate skill in searching, selecting, and evaluating sources to meet the information need.</td>
<td>- Repeats information provided without question or dismisses evidence without adequate justification.</td>
<td>- Repeats information provided without question or dismisses evidence without adequate justification.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration of <strong>context</strong>, assumptions, other perspectives and the credibility and authority of sources</th>
<th><strong>Advanced (4)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Proficient (3)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Developing (2)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Beginning (1)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Analysis acknowledges complexity and bias.</td>
<td>- Engages challenging ideas tentatively or in ways that overstate the conflict.</td>
<td>- Provides some recognition of context and consideration of assumptions and their implications.</td>
<td>- Approaches the issue in egocentric or socio-centric terms.</td>
<td>- Approaches the issue in egocentric or socio-centric terms.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development and presentation of <strong>argument</strong>, position or hypothesis, with logical progression</th>
<th><strong>Advanced (4)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Proficient (3)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Developing (2)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Beginning (1)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Presents and justifies clearly and in detail own argument, position, or hypothesis while qualifying or integrating contrary views or interpretations.</td>
<td>- Argument, position, or hypothesis includes original thinking that acknowledges, refutes, synthesizes or extends other assertions, although some aspects have not been fully developed.</td>
<td>- Argument, position, or hypothesis is clearly stated but with little original consideration.</td>
<td>- Argument, position, or hypothesis is unclear, simplistic, or re-stated with little original consideration.</td>
<td>- Argument, position, or hypothesis is unclear, simplistic, or re-stated with little original consideration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentation of <strong>conclusions</strong> and their implications</th>
<th><strong>Advanced (4)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Proficient (3)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Developing (2)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Beginning (1)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Identifies and discusses well-reasoned conclusions and their implications.</td>
<td>- Accurately presents well-reasoned conclusions.</td>
<td>- Accurately presents conclusions.</td>
<td>- Implications are absent.</td>
<td>- Fails to accurately identify conclusions or implications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Conclusions are simplistic, absolute, or attributed to an external authority.
Critical Thinking
Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board Language
Critical Thinking: to include creative thinking, innovation, inquiry, and analysis, evaluation and synthesis of information
VALUE language
Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.

Overview (taken from the VALUE rubric Framing Language)
This rubric is designed to be used across the disciplines, in recognition of the fact that success in all disciplines requires habits of inquiry and analysis that share common attributes. Further, research suggests that successful critical thinkers from all disciplines increasingly need to be able to apply those habits in various and changing situations encountered in all walks of life. This rubric is designed for use with many different types of assignments and the suggestions here are not an exhaustive list of possibilities. Critical thinking can be demonstrated in assignments that require students to complete analyses of text, data, or issues. If insight into the process components of critical thinking (e.g. how information sources were evaluated regardless of whether they were included in the product) is important, assignments focused on student reflection might be especially illuminating.

Glossary
- **Evidence**: Source material that is used to extend, in purposeful ways, writer’s ideas in a text.
- **Context**: The historical, ethical, political, cultural, environmental or circumstantial settings or conditions that influence and complicate the consideration of any issues, ideas, artifacts, and events.
- **Argument**: A coherent and logical series of statements leading from a premise to a conclusion.
- **Conclusion**: A synthesis of key findings drawn from research/evidence.
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